

Let us see all the costs and determine what we can and cannot afford.

Congress has the constitutional power to control these costs and it should do so when it relates to using taxpayer dollars to finance foreign operations which have limited importance in relation to our own national security.

H.R. 7 does not preclude other members of the United Nations from paying their fair share of United Nations operations that they deem to be important.

What it does do is close the open-ended bank account the United Nations has at the U.S. Treasury.

U.N. peacekeeping has overdrawn.

The United States is the only superpower left, but it is not a nation with an unlimited budget.

There are other wealthy nations that also have direct national interests in global peace and stability.

Japan and Germany are two such nations.

We ought to be encouraging them—strongly encouraging them—to become permanent members of the U.N. Security Council.

That way, these two wealthy countries can justify carrying more of the U.N.'s financial burden.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio [Ms. KAPTUR] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Ms. KAPTUR addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### UPDATE ON REPUBLICANS' CONTRACT WITH AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, in the first week of January the U.S. House of Representatives got rid of 3 standing committees, 25 subcommittees; we fired 682 congressional bureaucrats, and we totally reformed the procedures of the House of Representatives in addition to passing a bill that would make the Members of Congress live under the same laws and rules that we make everybody else in our society live under.

A couple of weeks ago we passed a balanced budget amendment. Week before last we passed legislation to keep the Federal Government from imposing unfunded mandates on the States.

Last Monday, on Ronald Reagan's birthday, we passed the line-item veto.

For conservatives across America, it is beginning to sink in: We won the election last November 8.

I think Republicans now have a great opportunity, but make no mistake, the responsibilities that come with victory are much greater than the responsibilities that come with defeat.

It seems to me we are now at a crossroads where we can change from being a nation at risk to being a nation with a hopeful future. I do hope all Americans realize they are part of a historic group, they are in a historic time as we

try to revolutionize the Federal Government's role in our lives.

Thirty-three years ago, when I got out of the Air Force and I bought my farm and I joined the local Hillsdale County Republican Party in Michigan, I was concerned because I was faced with a Federal Government that was telling me how many acres of different crops that I had to plant on my farm. It seemed important that I try to tell the Federal Government that if they want efficient farming, they cannot pass those kinds of mandates, not only on farmers but on all businesses of this country.

I think we all should be energized and excited to have this historic opportunity to bring about what many of us have been fighting for for many years, that is a leaner, more efficient Government, lower taxes, and stronger family values with more control and responsibility over our own lives.

But we can assume it is automatically going to happen. The forces of big government liberalism are stunned and in retreat, but they are not defeated. To make the spending cuts necessary to stop mortgaging our children's future will be very difficult. We are going to have to say "no" to the special interest groups and the lobbyists who fight for their pet projects.

It would seem to me that if we really wanted to look out for the future of this country and for future generations, we Republicans and Democrats and the President's people would get in a room and we would kick out the pollsters and the specialists of the special-interest lobbying groups and we would make the kind of tough decisions that we know must be made if we are going to cut down the overspending and over-regulation of this Government.

By cutting some of the programs we can no longer afford, even some of the good ones, Americans will have to make tough sacrifices.

□ 1550

But one lesson we have learned over the last 40 years is that, if we do not have the energy, and ability and willingness to do it today, it is not going to be done. I, for one, am willing to say no to that additional spending.

The time for talking is over. I think the American people will no longer tolerate excuses from Government, and I am giving this speech today because I am already seeing some traditionally conservative Members of this Chamber, even some Republicans, that are talking about backing away from the tough spending cuts. For this Chamber, for this Congress, to be successful, people all over America are going to have to do two things, I think. They are going to have to be willing for Government to do less for them, and they are going to have to be active in helping explain how serious this problem really is.

In conclusion let me challenge you, Mr. Speaker, and the Members of this body with a few statistics:

The interest on the Federal debt this year will be \$339 billion. That is more money than we take in, as my colleagues know, in total—one quarter, 25 percent of all the total revenues coming into this national Federal Government will be used, utilized, in paying the interest on the Federal debt. We are mortgaging our children's future, and I hope we will all be industrious and energetic in trying to make the tough spending cuts that we are going to be faced with.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ZELIFF). Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New York [Mr. OWENS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

[Mr. OWENS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.]

#### DISCUSSION OF WELFARE REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 4, 1995, the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. BAESLER] is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. BAESLER. Mr. Speaker, today what I would like to take the opportunity to discuss is the proposed welfare programs that we have been talking about here in the Capitol and throughout the country over the last several months. The question, I think, is why are we discussing welfare reform today in the Capitol and throughout the country? I think there are four basic reasons.

Everybody in the country, from whatever community you might live in, has seen abuses. They follow people through the food lines and see food stamps being used for things they did not think they ought to be used for. They know circumstances where food stamps have been sold for cash, trafficking in different stores throughout the community. They know people who live in section 8 housing who are not supposed to have other people live with them, but they know they are there. They report them, and nothing has happened. They know there are folks who could work that are not working who could do something constructive and are not doing something constructive. They know there are folks that all their life in all the generations have been on food stamps, poverty, other type of welfare programs, and they are frustrated. The public generally is frustrated and angry.

The second reason we are discussing welfare is because most of us understand that a welfare system itself breeds a great deal of crime, a disproportionate amount of crime. People who commit crime are those who are on welfare, more than those who are not.

A third reason that we are discussing welfare today is because we know we have to stop this cycle of poverty, we